



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,512	09/08/2003	David L. Cutsforth	1099.1103102	9160

28075 7590 01/12/2006

CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE  
SUITE 800  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420

EXAMINER
----------

MCDONALD, SHANTESE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/657,512

Applicant(s)

CUTSFORTH, DAVID L.

Examiner

Shantese L. McDonald

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 34-38, 44-46 and 51-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 46, 51, 52 and 57-59 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 34, 36-38, 53-56 and 60-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 35, 44 and 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 56,59 and 62 all recite the limitation "the finished depth" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 34,36-38,53-56 and 60-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall in view of Millas.

Marshall teaches forming a groove in a collector ring of an electrical motor, (col. 5, lines 60-64). Marshall teaches all the limitations of the claims except for cutting the groove using a hand held rotary grinder, and the groove having a first depth before the method is performed and a second depth after the method is performed and the finished depth of the groove being between 0.02 and 0.375 inches. Millas teaches using a hand held rotary grinder to produce grooves in a workpiece, (col. 1, lines 6-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the groove of Marshall using a hand held rotary grinder, as taught by Millas,

since the Marshall reference is silent as to what actually performs the machining of the groove, and the Millas reference teaches that it is known in the art to use a hand held grinder in order to mill or cut grooves in a workpiece. It would have been further obvious for the groove to have a first depth before the method and a second depth after the method, and for the finished depth to be between 0.02 and 0.375 inches, since it is obvious when cutting a groove for the operator to first begin cutting the groove and then choose to enlarge or further cut the groove, and also for the finish depth to be between 0.02 and 0.375, dependant upon the desired finished groove.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 35,44 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 46,51,52 and 57-59 allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34,36-38,53-56 and 60-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (571) 272-4486. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.L.M.  
January 9, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph J. Hail, III".

Joseph J. Hail, III  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 3700